

ELIGIBILITY, QUALIFICATION & TECHNICAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Wave Energy Feasibility Assessment for Four Caribbean Countries and One French Overseas Territory

A. Eligibility & Qualification Criteria

Minimum eligibility and qualification criteria will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.

If the Proposal is submitted as a Joint Venture, Consortium or Association, each member should meet the minimum eligibility criteria, unless otherwise specified.

No.	Criterion	Requirement
1	Completeness of the Proposal	Proposals will be examined to determine whether they are complete and submitted in accordance with RFP requirements. • Appropriate signatures. • Technical and Financial Proposals submitted separately.
2	Legal Status	The bidder must be a legally registered entity and provide valid registration/incorporation documentation.
3	Proposal Validity	120 Days
4	Ineligibility status	Vendor is not suspended, nor otherwise identified as ineligible by any UN Organization, the World Bank Group or any other International Organization.
5	Previous Experience	The bidder must demonstrate a minimum of ten (10) years of proven experience in marine/ocean renewable energy, including wave, tidal, offshore wind, OTEC or closely related marine-energy assignments
6	Average Annual Turnover	Should have average annual turnover of US\$ 2 Million for the last three years.

Note to Bidders: Submission of Eligibility and Qualification Documents

Bidders are required to submit all relevant supporting documents and verifiable evidence demonstrating compliance with the eligibility and qualification criteria specified in the RFP/TOR. These shall include, but not be limited to:

1. Valid legal registration/incorporation documents establishing the bidder's legal status.
2. A duly signed proposal submission letter, including explicit confirmation of acceptance of the 120-day proposal validity period.
3. A signed declaration confirming that the bidder is not suspended, sanctioned, debarred, or otherwise declared ineligible by any United Nations organization, the World Bank Group, or any other international organization.
4. Documentary evidence demonstrating a minimum of ten (10) years of relevant experience in marine/ocean renewable energy or closely related assignments.
5. Audited financial statements or other acceptable financial records for the last three years, demonstrating an average annual turnover of at least USD 2 million.
6. Any additional supporting documentation required under the eligibility and qualification criteria of the RFP/TOR.

Bidders must ensure that their submissions are complete, duly signed where applicable, and supported by sufficient documentary evidence. Failure to meet the prescribed eligibility and qualification requirements or provide adequate supporting documentation may result in disqualification from further evaluation.

Only bidders meeting the mandatory eligibility and qualification requirements shall proceed to the technical evaluation stage.

B. Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria – Summary Scoring Table

Purpose. This scoring framework is structured for the technical evaluation of proposals submitted for the Wave Energy Feasibility Assessment. It uses a 700-point technical score divided among firm experience, methodology and implementation approach, and management structure/key personnel.

No.	Evaluation Criterion	Weight	Maximum Points
I.	Expertise and Experience of the Firm/Organization	30%	210
II.	Proposed Methodology, Approach, Quality Assurance and Implementation Plan	40%	280
III.	Management Structure and Key Personnel	30%	210
	TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE	100%	700

Technical qualification threshold. A proposal must obtain at least 70% of the total technical score, i.e. 490 out of 700 points, to proceed to the financial evaluation.

I. Expertise of Firm/Organization

No.	Criterion and Scoring Methodology	Maximum Points
1.1	Overall institutional experience in marine/ocean renewable energy, including wave, tidal, offshore wind, OTEC or closely related marine-energy assignments. 15 years or more – 45 pts 12–14 years – 40 pts 10–11 years – 35 pts Less than 10 years – Mandatory requirement not met / non-responsive.	45
1.2	Experience undertaking wave-energy feasibility and investment studies for governments, utilities, development banks or comparable institutional clients. Particular consideration will be given to assignments combining resource assessment, technology assessment, engineering, grid integration, economic/financial analysis and investment assessment. Three or more highly comparable assignments of similar complexity and scope – 55 pts Two highly comparable assignments of similar complexity and scope – 40 pts One highly comparable assignments of similar complexity and scope – 30 pts Insufficient evidence of a comparable assignments of similar complexity and scope – 0pts	55

No.	Criterion and Scoring Methodology	Maximum Points
1.3	Demonstrated capability in in-situ marine data collection, including deployment, operation, maintenance and retrieval of directional wave buoys and ADCPs in open-ocean conditions. Three or more comparable campaigns, including tropical/hurricane-exposed conditions, with complete deployment-to-retrieval responsibility – 50 pts Two comparable campaigns, including at least one in a tropical/SIDS environment – 40 pts One substantial comparable campaign demonstrating the required capability – 30 pts No adequately demonstrated capability – 0 pts.	50
1.4	Bathymetric and geotechnical survey capability and multidisciplinary technical capacity, either in-house or through established subcontracting/consortium arrangements. Strong demonstrated capability in both bathymetric and geotechnical surveys together with a fully integrated multidisciplinary team across wave energy, marine engineering, power systems, oceanography and financial/economic analysis – 40 pts Adequate demonstrated capability covering all required disciplines with minor reliance on external resources – 30 pts Relevant capability demonstrated but with limited evidence of comparable integrated assignments – 20 pts More than two mandatory capabilities absent – 0 pts	40
1.5	Experience in SIDS, tropical/hurricane-exposed environments and multi-jurisdictional assignments, including ability to manage regional logistics, marine permitting, equipment mobilisation, shipping/customs and stakeholder coordination. Extensive relevant SIDS/Caribbean/tropical experience across two or more assignments – 20 pts Some relevant experience in one assignment – 10 pts No demonstrated comparable experience – 0 pts.	20
TOTAL SECTION I		210

II. Proposed Methodology, Approach and Implementation Plan

No.	Criterion and Scoring Methodology	Maximum Points
2.1	Understanding of the assignment, objectives, deliverables and regional context. Comprehensive understanding of the assignment, its 16-month timeframe, 12-month in-situ monitoring programme, investment-grade objectives, participating jurisdictions, principal implementation risks and interdependencies between technical and financial workstreams – 60 pts Good understanding with minor gaps or areas requiring clarification – 50 pts Basic understanding, but important interdependencies, risks or project requirements are insufficiently addressed – 35 pts Generic or materially incomplete understanding – 15 pts or less.	60
2.2	Methodology for in-situ data collection, marine surveys and equipment management. Assessment will include the approach to the EMMDRP; equipment availability/sourcing; calibration; mobilisation; permitting; customs and shipping; wave buoy and ADCP deployment; telemetry; data management; quarterly maintenance; equipment retrieval; HSE; bathymetric surveys; geotechnical investigations; contingency arrangements and QA/QC. Comprehensive, technically robust and clearly implementable methodology addressing all TOR requirements and marine-operational risks – 80 pts Strong methodology with minor gaps requiring clarification – 65 pts Generally responsive methodology but with significant implementation details missing – 45 pts Generic, incomplete or technically weak methodology – 25 pts or less.	80

Implemented by

In partnership with

No.	Criterion and Scoring Methodology	Maximum Points
2.3	Technical methodology for feasibility and investment assessment. Assessment will consider integration of wave-resource assessment, Phase A/Phase B site assessment, technology screening, hurricane survivability, engineering design, energy-yield modelling, grid integration, LCOE/economic analysis, financial modelling, bankability, investment prospects, risk assessment and feasibility determination. Highly integrated, technically rigorous methodology demonstrating clear linkages from resource data through engineering, economics and investment conclusions – 70 pts Sound methodology addressing almost all elements with minor integration gaps – 50 pts Adequate methodology but with limited detail or weak integration between technical and investment components – 35 pts Generic or incomplete methodology – 20 pts or less.	70
2.4	Implementation work plan, project management, quality assurance, risk management, monitoring and knowledge transfer. The work plan should demonstrate sequencing and parallel implementation within 16 months, responsibilities of experts, timing of deliverables, equipment mobilisation, the 12-month monitoring campaign, QA/QC, internal peer review, stakeholder engagement, risk management, reporting, data handover and knowledge transfer. Detailed, realistic and fully integrated plan with clear dependencies, responsibilities, milestones, monitoring arrangements and contingency measures – 70 pts Well-developed and feasible plan with minor areas requiring clarification – 55 pts Generally responsive plan but lacking detail on sequencing, responsibilities, QA or monitoring – 40 pts Generic or unrealistic work plan – 20 pts or less.	70
TOTAL SECTION II		280

III: Management Structure and Key Personnel

No.	Criterion and Scoring Methodology	Maximum Points
3.1	Management Structure, Team Composition and Availability. Clear organogram; well-defined roles and reporting lines; appropriate division of expert inputs; coordination between technical disciplines; demonstrated availability of the core team; realistic level of effort; and continuity throughout implementation. Excellent, fully integrated management structure and availability plan – 20 pts Good structure with minor gaps – 15 pts Adequate but requiring clarification – 10 pts Unclear or materially inadequate structure – 5 pts or less Failure to provide the mandatory core team shall render the proposal non-responsive.	20
3.2	Team Leader. Advanced degree and relevant leadership/technical experience in marine renewable energy and wave-energy assignments. PhD + 20 years or more relevant experience, extensive wave-energy leadership, multiple in-situ campaigns and strong SIDS/tropical experience – 40 pts MSc/PhD + 17–19 years relevant experience, at least 10 years wave energy and strong team-leadership record – 30 pts Meets the minimum TOR requirement of advanced degree, 15 years marine-renewable experience and 10 years wave-energy experience – 25 pts Below mandatory minimum – Non-responsive.	40

No.	Criterion and Scoring Methodology	Maximum Points
3.3	Wave Energy / Oceanographic Specialist. MSc/PhD with 12+ years relevant experience, multiple in-situ campaigns and advanced ERA5/WAVEWATCH III/SWAN and buoy/ADCP processing experience – 30 pts MSc/PhD with 10–11 years and strong comparable experience – 25 pts Meets minimum requirement of MSc or higher and 8 years relevant experience – 20 pts Below minimum – Non-responsive.	30
3.4	Marine Survey Coordinator. Relevant BSc/MSc qualification, marine-monitoring experience, wave-buoy/ADCP deployment capability and, where applicable, FIG/IHO Category A or equivalent. 8+ years relevant experience, multiple tropical/open-ocean campaigns and FIG/IHO Category A or equivalent – 25 pts 6–7 years with strong comparable experience – 20 pts Meets minimum 5-year requirement – 15 pts Below minimum – Non-responsive.	25
3.5	Marine/Coastal Engineer. Relevant engineering degree and experience in offshore structures, mooring systems, marine construction, hurricane engineering and geotechnical considerations. 15+ years highly relevant experience – 25 pts 12–14 years – 20 pts Meets minimum 10-year requirement – 15 pts Below minimum – Non-responsive.	25
3.6	Power Systems Engineer. Relevant electrical/power-systems qualification, small-island grid experience and modelling capability. 15+ years with extensive SIDS/small-grid modelling and strong PSS/E, DIgSILENT, Homer/REopt experience – 25 pts 12–14 years with strong comparable experience – 20 pts Meets minimum 10-year requirement – 15 pts Below minimum – Non-responsive.	25
3.7	Financial/Economic Analyst. Master's degree in finance/economics and renewable-energy financial modelling, LCOE, NPV/IRR, project finance, DFI and climate-finance expertise. 15+ years with extensive renewable-energy/DFI/project-finance experience – 25 pts 12–14 years with strong relevant experience – 20 pts Meets minimum 10-year requirement – 15 pts Below mandatory qualification/experience – Non-responsive.	25
3.8	GIS Analyst. Relevant GIS/Oceanography/Marine Science qualification and experience with ArcGIS/QGIS and oceanographic/bathymetric datasets. 8+ years highly relevant experience – 10 pts 6–7 years – 8 pts Meets minimum 5-year requirement – 7 pts Below minimum – Non-responsive.	10

No.	Criterion and Scoring Methodology	Maximum Points
3.9	Risk Analyst. Experience in technical/financial risk assessment for energy or infrastructure projects, including probability-impact analysis, risk matrices, mitigation planning and monitoring frameworks. 12+ years with extensive energy/marine infrastructure risk experience – 10 pts 10–11 years – 9 pts Meets minimum 8-year requirement – 7 pts Below minimum – Non-responsive.	10
TOTAL SECTION III		210

Note: Where a proposal does not fully meet the specific requirements outlined in the evaluation rubric, marks may be awarded on a pro-rata basis, commensurate with the extent to which the respective criterion is fulfilled, subject to the evaluators' assessment and justification.

Technical Qualification and Final Evaluation

Minimum Technical Qualification: A proposal must obtain at least 490 points out of 700 (70%) to be considered technically qualified and proceed to financial evaluation. In addition to obtaining the minimum technical score, the bidder must meet all mandatory eligibility and qualification requirements specified in the RFP. Failure to satisfy a mandatory requirement shall not be remedied through points obtained under other evaluation criteria.

Combined evaluation weighting: Technical Proposal – 80%; Financial Proposal – 20%.

Weighted Technical Score = (Technical Points Obtained ÷ 700) × 80

Indicative Weighted Financial Score = (Lowest Evaluated Financial Proposal ÷ Bidder's Evaluated Financial Proposal) × 20